

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 5, 2004 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-28 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, 27, and 28 have been amended, no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-28 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Rejections under § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10, 11, and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,758,328 to Giovannoli (hereafter "Giovannoli"), in view of U.S. patent 5,970,475 to Barnes et al. (hereafter "Barnes"). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giovannoli, in view of Barnes as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of U.S. patent 5,961,593 to Gabber et al. (hereafter "Gabber"). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giovannoli, in view of Barnes as applied to claim 1 above. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, insofar as they may be applied to the pending claims, for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1, 19, 27, and 28 relates to a method, system, or software for setting up electronic commerce/electronic data interchange (EC/EDI) between a user (or trading hub) and a plurality of selected trading partners (each having their own trading hubs) by providing a centralized host server that automatically determines the requirements of the plurality of selected trading partners including the particular or suitable EDI products or services required by the selected trading partners. In this manner, the user is set up for EDI with the selected trading partners by being registered for the suitable EDI products and services required by the selected trading partners for performing EDI with the selected trading partners. This recited arrangement is not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art.

Giovannoli relates to a computer based communications network of buyers or vendors and provides a variety of filtering options for determining which buyer requests go to which vendors based on filter conditions set by either the buyers or vendors or both. However, Giovannoli does not disclose or suggest the claimed requirement that a user (for example, a buyer) interact with a host server to retrieve EDI requirements for dealing (by using EDI) with a plurality of selected trading hubs and automatically register for the suitable EDI products or services for performing transactions using EDI with the selected trading partners.

In other words, Giovannoli does not disclose or suggest automatically setting up a customized trading infrastructure (EDI) that is customized to selected trading partners by allowing the user to register for the suitable EDI products or services that are required by the selected trading partners. Giovannoli merely discloses that the actual buying or selling of goods occurs using filters specified by either the buyer, vendor, or at a centralized source. There is no discussion of automatically setting up a customized trading infrastructure (EDI) with selected trading partners by guiding the user to register for suitable EDI products or services that are required by the selected trading partners so that goods/services can then be interchanged between the user and trading partners using a compatible EDI infrastructure.

Furthermore, this deficiency in Giovannoli is not cured by any of the other applied references. Accordingly, the pending independent claims are patentable over applied prior art. Specifically, Barnes relates to a system in which the users at one corporation can interact with multiple suppliers. There is no discussion of the user driven setting up of EDI infrastructure with a plurality of selected trading partners by automatically registering for the specific suitable EDI products and services required by the plurality of selected trading partners in order to transact business with the selected trading partners by using EDI. Neither do any of the other applied references disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Accordingly, the pending independent claims are patentable over the applied prior art.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request entry and reconsideration because it is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 3, 2004

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee
William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874
Aaron C. Chatterjee
Registration No. 41,398
Attorneys for Applicants